

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/623,356	07/18/2003		David L. McCutchen	2254.02C	2254.02C 5041	
7303	7590	07/08/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FRANK J CATALANO				TILL, TERRENCE R		
FRANK J C. 100 WEST 5		O, P.C. IOTH FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	TULSA, OK 74103-4990			1744		

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	م	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/623,356	MCCUTCHEN, DAVID L.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
TI MAN ING DATE (III	Terrence R. Till	1744
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply sis specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 Ag 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under Ex 	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-9 and 11-18 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So on is required if the drawing(s) is of	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applica ity documents have been receiv (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/15/05.	_	y (PTO-413) Date 2<u>00</u>≶6706 Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/623,356

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finigan '729 (cited previously).
- 4. The patent to Finigan discloses a vacuum cleaning machine comprising a canister 16 having an inlet port 12 and three outlet ports 44, three filters 22 disposed inside of said canister, each one in pneumatic communication through a corresponding one of each of said outlet ports, a vacuum source 24, three valves 76, each said valve being in pneumatic communication between said vacuum source and a corresponding one of each of said outlet ports and permitting air to be drawn by said vacuum source from said inlet port simultaneously through corresponding ones of said filters and means (see paragraph 37) for sequentially operating said valves to switch said filters from connection to said vacuum source to connection to ambient air whereby ambient air

is intermittently drawn sequentially through corresponding ones of said valves and said filters into said canister. It is not clear if the valves are disposed outside of said canister or are aligned with the canister wall. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the valves to be disposed on the outside of the canister, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 2-9 and 11-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. Claims 19 and 20 are allowed.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Dietz et al., Hayden, Fisher et al. and Strauser et al. all disclose of backflow cleaning of filters using ambient air.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terrence R. Till whose telephone number is (571) 272-1280. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. through Thurs. and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sun U. Kim can be reached on (571) 272-1142. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/623,356 Page 4

Art Unit: 1744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Terrence R. Till
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1744

trt